

Public Management Policies: A Comparative Analysis of the USA and the UK

Wenqing Chen*

Faculty of Public Management, University of Birmingham, Birmingham B15 2TT, United Kingdom

**Corresponding author:* Wenqing Chen, 419322781@qq.com

Abstract: Public management forms the formal and informal processes and procedures for guiding human interaction with public organisations in order to help them to meet the requirements and objectives of the organisation. In addition to this, these approaches also aim to higher the level of human's satisfaction with public organisations and transform their behaviour and attitudes. The object of public administration is society as a whole or its individual groups, socio-political, economic, cultural and other organisations, their activities ^[1]. Based on these factors, the current study aims to analyse and compare the public management approaches by taking a case study of two countries, such as the USA and the UK. In addition to this, the key similarities and differences will also be identified. For the sake of both public and public sector organisations, government management is very relevant. Taking into account the role of public administration, this comparative case study is quite valuable. This comparison helps to suggest the best public management methods by using them to achieve public satisfaction in underdeveloped countries. Other countries' public service sectors will know how to please the public with the help of identified approaches to public policy. The methodology also increases the validity of this case study, as the most recent, up-to-date secondary information is used.

Keywords: Public management; Comparative analysis; Public service sectors; Human's satisfaction

Publication date: October 2021; **Online publication:** October 29, 2021

1. Comparing public management in the US and UK

1.1. Public management policies in the UK

The United Kingdom is established under a parliamentary monarch as a unitary state having more power given to policies in Northern Ireland, Wales, and Scotland. The public management policies were not assumed until the mid-1980. The public management policies of the UK entered the formation stage during the late 1990s ^[2]. After that, the public management authorities started conducting the centralised planning economy where the resources are allocated by the government administration to the society and directly regulate the public institutions and society. The public management policies in the UK revolve around taxation, national defence, and legislature activities etc. Montañés et al. highlighted that the public management in the UK comprises the public service employees and civil service employees for the effective policy formulation and implementation. The UK local democracy project is the committee based on the municipal government that is engaged in offering the standard and cost-effective products along with a roadmap for implementation that leads towards the maximum public benefit. Concerning this, a UK local e-government product catalogue allows users to access and download numerous national-level policies and project statistics and output to efficiently review the policy implementation ^[3]. Hence, the UK being a unitary state, has revolutionised the public management policies in the areas where there is an especially

huge population.

The UK has made the public administration open for delivering services to the public. The governmental agencies are engaged in handling affairs matter to the interest of people. However, these affairs do not involve state secrets. Concerning this, the exposing of the government along with civil servants in the external examination can help to reduce the subjectivism, confidentiality, impulsiveness, power abusive, and corrupt attitude. Margret Thatcher's reform has revolutionised the policies in the late 1980s that facilitate the traders to send and receive a huge amount of money for trading along with the financial networks. However, these policies also target the public management by targeting the governmental sector and privatised these sectors to increase their performance in terms of facilitating the public ^[4]. Additionally, according to the constitutional reforms and governance act 2010, the civil servants in the UK work separately from the government for providing maximum public benefit. However, the act restricts the unlawful use of civil servants in state and governmental affairs against any national-level issue. Economic growth and social development both are considered analytical instruments to handle public management in the UK. The UK government takes it as an International Expansion Agenda that needs the civil authorities, community, and the citizen to work intentionally for creating sound public management ^[5]. Hence, it is concluded that the public management policies are the combination of numerous contributed approaches that are adopted by the UK government and authorities in properly managing the public administration.

1.2. Public management policies in the USA

The public management policies in the USA have seen a huge transformation with the rise in globalisation. Throughout the public policy of the USA, the leaders and the government of the USA have contributed a lot in shaping the policies for effectively managing the public. Many public policies have shaped the modern policy approach in the USA. America was formed based on the assumption that people have the right to contribute to the generation of laws that affect public policy and their privileges. Additionally, the US public policy of the 20th century has made the development of government, administration, and services to the public create some constitutional and public issues ^[6]. Concerning this, the foreign policy of the USA regulates the money market and the funds so that the business cannot suffer. The United States House committee is engaged in regulating foreign affairs, including the commercial interaction and the safeguarding of business subsidies outside the USA. The organisation of American states and the organisation of security cooperation in Europe are seen as effective managers for bringing the management reforms ^[7]. Additionally, the Homeland Security Act 2002 comprised 118 members of Congress and working as the largest department after the department of defence. The Homeland Security Act marked the greatest shift towards greater flexibility in public policy. This policy focuses on the management of the policy subsystem in the USA that has been hugely steady, effectively struggling with an agenda of outcomes to perceived problems ^[8]. Therefore, the public management policies have significantly contributed towards the effective management of policies in the USA.

1.3. Differences between public management policies of the US and UK

Within the context of the USA, the experience of using the programmatic approach in the United States shows that its implementation is not a one-time action, with finite time benchmarks. This is a long-term systematic work, including a coordinated reform of the budgetary, administrative, political processes, as well as a significant change in the methods of collecting and processing statistical information. In addition to this, the new model for public management is being followed by both the USA and the UK, but there are many gaps between national and national public management policies. First, UK public policies focus on the management of funds, while US public policies grow such that they are performing in a way that governs

public management. Public services organisations report to the Budget and management office each year, and this is sent additionally to the President.

Among the numerous approaches to organising the public administration process, “New The comparative study in this section shows very clearly that the UK and the USA have implemented three main public administration policies. The three main policy areas are focused on a modern public management model, comprising regulatory policies, policy restrictions and policy facilitation. Similar strategies are pursued between the USA and the UK, but policy application and structuring differences. The United States has also accumulated a wealth of experience in the development of software methods. Moreover, initially, software tools were used mainly in the military departments of government^[9]. However, in the United States, there was initially a close relationship between management in business and public administration. Therefore, the American history of the development of the programmatic approach is characterised by the rather successful use by the state of management tools that were initially spread in the private sector. In addition, the government in this country has devoted a lot of attention to developing methods for linking the political process, budgeting and reforming management by results. Therefore, this experience is important for all countries striving to rebuild their management systems in the spirit of NSU. The programmatic approach in the United States initially considered target program budgeting as a priority, i.e. linking program activities with their funding. There are several stages in the development of the programmatic approach and program-targeted budgeting in the United States, each of which differed in special procedures linking the spending of public funds with the results of programmes. Nevertheless, the monitoring public administration policies as described in the new policy on public management in the United Kingdom and the United States of America have a significant inconsistency. The UK observes a set of stringent laws but, for its own reasons, these laws are broken by political individuals.

2. Conclusion

The public management is used for forming the informal and formal procedures and processes that are used for facilitating the human interaction with the public organisations for the purpose of helping them in meeting the aims of the organisations. This analysis has been conducted to analyse and compare the public management in the UK and the USA. UK comprises distinct countries with several cultures and languages. This is the reason it is said to be a mixture of cultures of numerous immigrants and indigenous people like Pakistanis, African and Indians. London is the largest city of the UK and is also known for being its capital with the centre of finance, economics and culture with a population of 8 million people. Along with this, the USA is also a multicultural country as the migrants have transformed there for over 200 years. The USA is known for having most diverse landscapes. Further, the country contains strong and reliable management approaches that resulted in a strong economy and well-developed infrastructure. For this analysis, the researcher has adopted a deductive research approach and interpretivism research philosophy. Along with this, a qualitative research study has been conducted by the researcher by relying on the collection of secondary data. The researcher has analysed the data using the comparative data analysis techniques and the followed the ethical considerations for conducting an ethical research study.

It can be concluded from the findings of the research study that the object of public administration is society as a whole or its individual groups, socio-political, economic, and cultural and other organisations, their activities. UK public policies focus on the management of funds, while US public policies grow such that they are performing in a way that governs public management. Moreover, the governments of developed countries, e.g. the USA and the UK went for a partial or more radical restructuring of the public sector management system, which indicates that there is a general need for administrative reforms. It has also been analysed that both UK and USA consist of the population with diverse cultures and languages. It is recommended that both the countries should implement the policies that are in favour of people belonging

to all the cultures and languages. Along with this, discrimination should also be eliminated from the countries and strict action should be taken against the ones who promote cultural discrimination within the country so that all the people living in these countries can spend their lives freely. The focus of this study was on two countries only which are USA and UK and both are considered developed countries. The findings may be fairly different in other countries. Therefore, it is recommended to consider the comparison among different countries where developing countries should also be considered. The number of countries involved in comparison should also be increased.

Disclosure statement

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Shafritz J, et al., 2016, *Introducing Public Administration*. Routledge.
- [2] Wimbush E, 2011, *Implementing an Outcomes Approach to Public Management and Accountability in the UK — Are We Learning the Lessons*. *Public money & management*, 31(3): 211-218.
- [3] Hood C, Dixon R, 2016. *Not what it Said on the Tin? Reflections on Three Decades of UK Public Management Reform*. *Financial Accountability & Management*, 32(4): 409-428.
- [4] Andrews R, et al., 2013, *Public Sector Reform in the UK: Views and Experiences from Senior Executives*. *Coordination for Cohesion in the Public Sector of the Future*, 1-46.
- [5] Alonso JM, et al., 2015, *Did New Public Management Matter? An Empirical Analysis of the Outsourcing and Decentralisation Effects on Public Sector Size*. *Public Management Review*, 17(5): 643-660.
- [6] Raipa A, 2002, *Public Policy and Public Administration: Development, Structure, and Reciprocity*. *Public Policy and Administration*, 1(1): 11-20.
- [7] Moynihan DP, 2005, *Homeland Security and the US Public Management Policy Agenda*. *Governance*, 18(2): 171-196.
- [8] Clark LE, 2020, *Homeland Security Act of 2002*. In *Encyclopedia of Public Administration and Public Policy*, Third Edition, Routledge, 1-4.
- [9] Funck EK, Karlsson TS, 2020, *Twenty-Five Years of Studying New Public Management in Public Administration: Accomplishments and Limitations*. *Financial Accountability & Management*, 36(4): 347-375.